



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231


SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10777893	02/12/04	John Rush	CST-201 CIP

EXAMINER	
PENSEE	DO
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1641	11/03/05

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) PENSEE DO (PTO) (3) MR. JAMES CULLEN - 
(2) BAD-THUY NGUYEN (PTO) (4) Dr. John Rush (Inventor)
Andrew Warner

Date of interview 11/03/05

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description:

Draft claims & Reference by Manfredo Quadroni + Peter James "Phosphopeptide analysis" Proteomics in Functional Genomics 2000

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☐ was not reached. N/A

Claims discussed: All of Record

Identification of prior art discussed: Little et al.


proposed draft claims ~~discussed~~ distinguish over ~~proposed~~ Little

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant distinguishes the invention from the 1st ref. Little art points out the novelty of the invention by explaining that the invention draws out a "population" of naturally occurring post translationally modified peptides instead of one peptide ~~there is in~~ ~~art~~ Little, and manmade modification, whereas Little teaches peptide-specific modification.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.


Examiner's Signature